THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V.ESWARAIAH

W.P. No. 20011 of 2007

Date:20-09-2007

Between:

Chetan Maru **…Petitioner**

AND

The District Collector, Ranga Reddy and two others

.. Respondents

ORDER:

The petitioner seeks a writ of mandamus to declare the inaction of the respondents for not considering the application filed by the petitioner before the respondents on 10.05.2007 and reminder memo dated 16.06.2007 for conversion of the agricultural land into non-agricultural in respect of land in Sy.No.323/A admeasuring Ac.1-24 guntas, in respect of the land in Sy.No.323/E admeasuring Ac.2-12 guntas, in respect of the land in Sy.No.323/AA admeasuring Ac.2-00 guntas totaling admeasuring Ac.5-36 guntas situated at Batasingaram, Hayathnagar mandal, Ranga Reddy District, as illegal and arbitrary.

It is the case of the petitioner that he purchased land of an extent of Ac.5-36 guntas situated at Batasingaram, Hayathnagar mandal, Ranga Reddy District which are the agricultural lands. It is stated that to convert the said lands into non-agricultural lands, the petitioner filed applications before the Revenue Divisional Officer Eastern Division, Ranga Reddy District, at Mallakunta Hyderabad on 11.05.2007 and 16.06.2007 along with the prescribed proforma in Annexure-A. It is stated that under the provisions of Agricultural Land (Conversion For Non-Agricultural Purposes) Act, 2006 read with Rules 2006, (for short "the Act") there is a prohibition for conversion of the lands under Section 3 of the said Act and under Section 5 of the Act, the authority competent to convert the agricultural lands into non-agricultural lands is the Revenue Divisional Officer by collecting 10% of the basic value of the land. It is further stated that if any agricultural land has been put to non-agricultural purpose without obtaining the permission as required under Section 3, the land shall be deemed to

have been converted into non-agricultural purpose and upon such deemed conversion, the competent authority shall impose a fine of 50% over and above the conversion fee for the said land specified under Section 4 of the Act.

As the applications of the petitioners are pending before the Revenue Divisional Officer, I am of the opinion that it is just and proper to direct the second respondent to consider and dispose of the said applications.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of directing the second respondent to consider and dispose of the said applications of the petitioner in accordance with the provisions of the said Act, as expeditiously as possible, without any undue delay. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

V.ESWARAIAH, J.

Date:20.09.2007

ccm